

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

RODNEY WILLIS,

Plaintiff,

-v-

CITY OF NEW YORK, KEVIN PERDOMO, and
DENISE TURNER,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 24 Civ. 735 (JGLC) (SLC)

ORDER

SARAH L. CAVE, United States Magistrate Judge.

The Court is in receipt of three letters filed by pro se Plaintiff Rodney Willis. (ECF Nos. 56; 57; 58 (collectively, the “Letters”)). The first two letters, dated September 8, 2024 (ECF No. 57) and September 9, 2024 (ECF No. 58), are nearly identical in that they each (1) ask the Court to deny Defendants any further extensions of time in this matter, (2) provide a statement of Plaintiff’s claims, and (3) request that the Court “grant [Plaintiff’s] Motion for Summary Judgment[.]” (ECF Nos. 57–58). In the third letter, which is dated October 11, 2024, Plaintiff claims that a manager at his office is “asking other managers if they have any information worthy of write up or reprimand regarding plaintiff” and that other individuals are “asking colleagues . . . to monitor plaintiff in exchange for personal favor[s.]” (ECF No. 56 at 1). The Court addresses the requests contained in the Letters in turn.

First, Plaintiff’s request that no further extensions be granted in this matter is DENIED. Despite their earlier dates of acceptance by the Pro Se Intake Unit, the Letters were not entered on the docket until October 16, 2024, on which date the Court granted Corporation Counsel for the City of New York’s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Defendant Denise Turner (the “Motion

to Withdraw”). (See ECF No. 59 (the “Oct. 16 Order”)). As explained in the Oct. 16 Order, the Court has stayed the case for 30 days to allow Defendant Turner to retain new counsel. (Id.) Although the Court recognizes Plaintiff’s frustration with what he perceives as unwarranted delays in this case moving forward, his request to deny any further extensions of time is denied for the reasons stated in the Oct. 16 Order.

Plaintiff’s request that the Court enter summary judgment in his favor is also DENIED. Plaintiff previously filed a Motion for Summary Judgment that the Court denied as premature. (See ECF No. 49 (the “Sept. 27 Order”)). As explained in the Sept. 27 Order, the parties have not yet engaged in any discovery in this matter, and “courts routinely deny motions for summary judgment as premature when discovery over relevant matters is incomplete.” Toussie v. Allstate Ins. Co., 213 F. Supp. 3d 444, 445 (E.D.N.Y. 2016). The Sept. 27 Order also explained that Plaintiff would be “afforded an opportunity to move for summary judgment on an appropriate date the Court will set following resolution of the Motion to Withdraw, any refiled Motion to Dismiss, and completion of discovery.” (ECF No. 49 at 2–3). In other words, Plaintiff will be permitted to submit further evidence supportive of his claims, but his current request for entry of summary judgment, like his last request for the same relief, is premature and denied as such.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to Mr. Willis.

Dated: New York, New York
October 17, 2024

SO ORDERED.


SARAH L. CAVE
United States Magistrate Judge